UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,947	04/21/2004	Edward Triou JR.	MSFT-3017/307734.01	7147

41505   7590   11/01/2006

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
ASSESSOR, BRIAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2114	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 April 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 April 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/21/2004*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13, 14, 22-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Roddy (20030208706).

As per claim 1, Roddy teaches:

A method for analyzing test results, comprising:

comparing test result data corresponding to at least two test failures; (Roddy

page 4, paragraph 57)

determining at least one representative test failure corresponding to at least one

related test failure; (Roddy page 4, paragraph 57)

linking said at least one related test failure to said at least one representative test

failure in a database. (Roddy page 4, paragraph 57)

As per claim 2, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is accomplished by a stored procedure in a database. (Roddy page 2, paragraph 11)

As per claim 3, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 1, further comprising cross-referencing said test result data corresponding to at least two test failures such that at least one property of said at least one related test failure is accessible from said at least one related test failure without accessing all properties of said at least one related test failure. (Roddy page 4, paragraph 57)

As per claim 5, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 1, further comprising marking said at least one representative test failure as an expected failure. (Roddy page 2, paragraph 10)

As per claim 7:

Claim 7 is a computer readable medium corresponding to the method claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 8, Roddy teaches:

A method for classifying test results, comprising:

extracting data from a test result file; (Roddy page 4, paragraph 57; new fault log data is compared to prior fault log data)

comparing said data to failure characteristics stored in a database; (Roddy page

4, paragraph 57)

linking said data from a test result file to said failure characteristics if said data

from a test result file matches said failure characteristics. (Roddy page 4, paragraph

57)

As per claim 9, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 8, further comprising marking properties of test

result files to be ignored during said comparing. (inherent; Roddy is only concerned

with comparing fault data and the system parameters at the time of the fault.)

As per claim 10, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 8, wherein at least one of said failure characteristics

is an abstract characteristic that can be matched by a variety to data from a test result

file. (Roddy page 4, paragraph 57; an investigation of the cause of the fault may be

done using expert system analysis.)

As per claim 11, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 8, further comprising adding new failure

characteristics to said database if said data from a test result file does not match said

failure characteristics, wherein said new failure characteristics correspond to said data

from a test result file. .(Roddy page 4, paragraph 57; if no match is found an expert

system analysis is used, and the repair log is updated.)

As per claim 13, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 8, wherein said data from a test result file is

describes results from a tested software operation. (Roddy page 2, paragraph 11)

As per claim 14, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 8 further comprising marking failure characteristics

to indicate that the failure they represent is expected. (Roddy page 2, paragraph 10)

As per claim 22, Roddy teaches:

A method for classifying test results, comprising:

extracting data from a test result file; (Roddy page 4, paragraph 57; new fault log

data is compared to prior fault log data)

comparing said data from a test result file to failure characteristics stored in a

database, wherein first data that identifies a test operation is used in said comparison

and second data that identifies a test scenario is not used in said comparison; (Roddy

page 4, paragraph 57)

if a match is discovered from said comparing, identifying said data from a test

result file and said failure characteristics as a single failure. (Roddy page 4, paragraph

57)

As per claim 23, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 22, wherein said comparing is accomplished by a

stored procedure in a database. (Roddy page 2, paragraph 11)

As per claim 24, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 22, further comprising cross-referencing said data

from a test result file such that at least one property of said data from a test result file

accessible from said single failure. (Roddy page 4, paragraph 57)

As per claim 26, Roddy teaches:

A method according to claim 22, wherein said data from a test result file is

automated software testing data. (Roddy page 1, paragraph 1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 6, 12, 15-21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Roddy (20030208706) in view of Snover (6,438,716).

As per claim 4:

Roddy does not explicitly disclose exposing said at least one representative test

failure through a Graphic User Interface ("GUI").

In column 1, lines 17-21, Snover clearly discloses a method for using a GUI to

display error information. IT would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to include the GUI display as taught by Snover in order

to keep the user more informed. This would have been obvious because Snover

clearly teaches that the above process is better suited for displaying error detection

and correction information. (Snover column 1, lines 8-15)

As per claim 6:

Roddy does not explicitly disclose deemphasizing said at least one

representative test failure in a GUI with respect to any unexpected failures.

In column 1, lines 17-21, Snover clearly discloses a method for using a GUI to

display error information. IT would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to include the GUI display as taught by Snover in order

to keep the user more informed. This would have been obvious because Snover

clearly teaches that the above process is better suited for displaying error detection

and correction information. (Snover column 1, lines 8-15)

As per claim 12:

Roddy does not explicitly disclose emphasizing said new failure characteristics in a GUI with respect to failure characteristics that are not new.

In column 1, lines 17-21, Snover clearly discloses a method for using a GUI to display error information. IT would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the GUI display as taught by Snover in order to keep the user more informed. This would have been obvious because Snover clearly teaches that the above process is better suited for displaying error detection and correction information. (Snover column 1, lines 8-15)

As per claim 15, Roddy teaches:

A system for analyzing test results, comprising:

a first process for extracting test result data from test result files; (Roddy page 2, paragraph 11)

a second process for comparing said test result data and classifying said test result data into groups; (Roddy page 2, paragraph 11)

a database for storing said groups; (Roddy page 2, paragraph 11)

Roddy does not explicitly disclose a Graphic User Interface ("GUI") for exposing said groups stored in said database.

In column 1, lines 17-21, Snover clearly discloses a method for using a GUI to display error information. IT would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to include the GUI display as taught by Snover in order

to keep the user more informed. This would have been obvious because Snover

clearly teaches that the above process is better suited for displaying error detection

and correction information. (Snover column 1, lines 8-15)

As per claim 16, Roddy teaches:

The system of claim 15, further comprising a test operation that produces an

output test result file with properties that are marked to be ignored by said first process

or by said second process. (inherent; Roddy is only concerned with comparing fault

data and the system parameters at the time of the fault.)

As per claim 17, Roddy teaches:

The system of claim 15, wherein said test result files are the output of automated

software tests. (Roddy page 1, paragraph 1)

As per claim 18, Roddy teaches:

The system of claim 15, wherein classifying said test result data into groups

comprises cross-referencing at least one property of said test result data so all

variations of the at least one property are grouped together. (Roddy page 4, paragraph

57)

As per claim 19, Roddy teaches:

The system of claim 15, wherein said groups are identified by representative test

failures. (Roddy page 2, paragraph 11)

As per claim 20, Roddy teaches:

The system of claim 19, further comprising marking at least one representative

test failure as an expected failure. (Roddy page 2, paragraph 10)

As per claim 20:

Roddy does not explicitly disclose deemphasizing said at least one

representative test failure in the GUI.

In column 1, lines 17-21, Snover clearly discloses a method for using a GUI to

display error information. IT would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to include the GUI display as taught by Snover in order

to keep the user more informed. This would have been obvious because Snover

clearly teaches that the above process is better suited for displaying error detection

and correction information. (Snover column 1, lines 8-15)

As per claim 25:

Roddy does not explicitly disclose exposing said single failure through a Graphic User

Interface ("GUI").

In column 1, lines 17-21, Snover clearly discloses a method for using a GUI to display error information. IT would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the GUI display as taught by Snover in order to keep the user more informed. This would have been obvious because Snover clearly teaches that the above process is better suited for displaying error detection and correction information. (Snover column 1, lines 8-15)

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roddy (20030208706) in view of Graichen (7,107,491).

As per claim 27:

Roddy does not explicitly disclose a method wherein said data from a test result file is in Extensible Markup Language ("XML") format.

On page 4, paragraph 30, Graichen clearly discloses a method where XML is a commonly used language when dealing with reliability. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the method as taught by Graichen in order to give an accessible and commonly used language for error handling systems. This would have been obvious because Graichen teaches that the above language is better suited when dealing with system reliability. (Graichen page 1, paragraph 4)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Brian J. Assessor whose telephone number is (571) 272-0825.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Scott Baderman can be reached on (571)272-3644. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BA

SCOTT BADERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER